



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/457,420	12/07/1999	DEAN HILLER	11324/1	= 7662

7590 04/24/2003

KENYON & KENYON  
333 W SAN CARLOS STREET  
SUITE 600  
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/457,420

Applicant(s)

HILLER, DEAN

Examiner

Chau Nguyen

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment A, received on 02/07/2003, has been entered. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber et al (Farber), Patent No. 6,185,598, and further in view of Jerger et al. (Jerger), Patent No. 6,345,361.

4. As to claim 1, Farber discloses the invention as claimed, a method of processing an Internet site name comprising:

retrieving a regular expression stored at a Domain Name Server (col. 7, line 3 - col. 8, line 25, Fig. 2); and

performing a regular expression comparison between a first Internet site name and a character pattern at a Domain Name Server (col. 7, line 3 – col. 8, line 25, Fig. 2 and Fig. 3: the resource identifier (URL) for a given request is looked up in the rule base by matching it sequentially with each regular expression).

However, Farber does not disclose identify an Internet Protocol address for multiple similar site names. In the same field of endeavor, Jerger discloses wildcard characters may be used to specify multiple domain names (col. 17, lines 50-67). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Farber and Jerger to include identifying an Internet Protocol address for multiple similar site names. Jerger suggests using wildcard characters such as "\*" or "?" for searching site names. Using these teachings combination with the DNS name resolving taught by Farber would result in the invention as broadly claimed by resolving regular expression into an IP address.

5. As to claim 2, Farber and Jerger (Farber-Jerger) disclose transmitting the first Internet site name from a first computer system to the Domain Name Server over the Internet (Farber, col. 2, line 64 – col. 3, line 63 and col. 6, lines 40-56: a client makes a request for a particular resource (URL) from a server, the request including a resource identifier for the particular resource, and then the request is transmitted to the server (DNS)).

Art Unit: 2142

6. As to claim 3, Farber-Jerger disclose transmitting a responsive message to the first computer system if a match is found in the regular expression comparison (Farber, col. 7, line 3 – col. 8, line 25, Fig. 2 and Fig. 3: the server 102 then sends back to the client 106 a reply containing the requested resource).

7. Claims 9-12 are corresponding apparatus and a set of instruction claims containing similar limitations as discussed in the method of claims 1-3; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 4-8 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farber and Jerger as applied to claims 1-3, and 9-12 above, and further in view of Schneider, Patent No. 6,338,082.

Art Unit: 2142

10. As to claim 4, Farber discloses the limitations as described in claims 1-3. However, Farber does not disclose the regular expression uses a Unix regular expression format. In the same field of endeavor, Schneider discloses DNS is implemented in a hierarchy of DNS servers (Unix machines running Berkeley Internet Name Domain (BIND) software) and an application-layer protocol that allows hosts and DNS servers to communicate in order to provide the translation service (col. 3, lines 4-38 and col. 9, lines 45-56). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the use of Unix regular expression as taught by Schneider into the system comparing between an Internet address name and characters at a DNS of Farber, thereby resulting in the claimed invention, since Schneider suggests that BIND is integrated into UNIX network programs for use in storing and retrieving host names and addresses.

11. As to claim 5, Farber-Jerger and Schneider (Farber-Jerger-Schneider) disclose the regular expression has a format  $\text{^d}\{10\}\$.X.Y$  where  $\text{^d}\{10\}\$$  represents a string of ten numbers, X represents a sub-level domain and Y represents a top-level domain (Jerger, col. 17, lines 12-67: "\*" character indicates zero or more characters and "?" indicates any single character, ".com" indicates top-level domain, ".microsoft.com" indicates sub-level domain or second level domain; Schneider, col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 12).

Art Unit: 2142

12. As to claim 6, Farber-Jerger-Schneider disclose the regular expression has a format  $^{[0-9]+\$.X.Y}$  where  $^{[0-9]+\$}$  represents a string of numbers, X represents a sub-level domain and Y represents a top-level domain (Jerger, col. 17, lines 12-67: "\*" character indicates zero or more characters and "?" indicates any single character, ".com" indicates top-level domain, ".microsoft.com" indicates sub-level domain or second level domain; Schneider, col. 3, line 66 – col. 4, line 12).

13. As to claim 7, Farber-Jerger-Schneider disclose the regular expression has a format  $^{d\{10\}\$.Z}$  where  $^{d\{10\}\$}$  represents a string of ten numbers, and Z represents a geographically oriented top-level domain (Jerger, col. 17, lines 12-67: "\*" character indicates zero or more characters and "?" indicates any single character, ".com" indicates top-level domain, ".microsoft.com" indicates sub-level domain or second level domain; Schneider, col. 4, lines 13-30).

14. As to claim 8, Farber-Jerger-Schneider disclose the regular expression has a format  $^{[0-9]+\$.Z}$  where  $^{[0-9]+\$}$  represents a string of numbers, and Z represents a geographically oriented top-level domain (Jerger, col. 17, lines 12-67: "\*" character indicates zero or more characters and "?" indicates any single character, ".com" indicates top-level domain, ".microsoft.com" indicates sub-level domain or second level domain, Schneider, col. 4, lines 13-30).

Art Unit: 2142

15. Claims 13-17 are corresponding a set of instruction claims containing the similar limitations as the methods described in claims 4-8; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.



***Response to Arguments***

16. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on 02/07/2003 have been fully considered but they are not deemed fully persuasive. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection as explained here below, necessitated by Applicant's substantial amendment (i.e., identifying an Internet Protocol address for multiple similar site names and;  $\text{^d}\{10\}$  represents a string of ten numbers and  $\text{^[0-9]+}$  represents a string of numbers) to the claims which significantly affected the scope thereof.

Art Unit: 2142

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4639. The examiner can normally be reached at 8:00 am – 5:00 pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Powell can be reached on (703) 305-9703. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3230.

Art Unit: 2142

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

**Box AF**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20131

**Or Faxed to:**

(703) 746-7239, (for **formal communications**; please mark  
"EXPEDITE PROCEDURE").

**Or:**

(703) 746-7240 (for **informal or draft communications**, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT").

**Or:**

(703) 746-7238 (for **After Final Communications**).

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal  
Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Chau Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2142

MARC THOMPSON  
GAW 2142  
4/18/03